2155

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 19. **NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 25, 1896.** **Whole No. 331.**

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

"El Perseguido," an advocate of violent revolution, uses these words in commemorating the death of a martyr to that policy: "The comrade whose memory we recall to-day had understood that we must cut off the head of the *bourgeois* hydra." This is an uncommonly apt characterization of the dynamite-and-dagger programme.

New York moralists are congratulating themselves on a decision of the appellate court which promises to reduce greatly the number of saloons. Dealers whose places are situated within two hundred feet of a church or school cannot transfer their licenses hereafter, under the law which prohibits new saloons from being opened near such sacred institutions. The "Sun" correctly observes that, "in effect, the decision is that New York has a statute which might be made in a generation absolutely prohibitory of liquor-selling in crowded communities, provided only churches and schools were built thick enough." The "Evening Post," sneering at this suggestion, exclaims: "Imagine the awful condition of a community which had more churches and schools than saloons!" Yes, it would be awful. The poor people will not go to church, and life without the saloons, which have been described as the clubs of the poor, would be dreary indeed. How nauseating this hypocritical talk about saloons is! The gentry who indulge in it generally drink more than those whom they would piously protect against the influences of saloons.

The "Open Court" is thoroughly right in declaring that the Monroe doctrine "is a question of power, not of right or wrong." Those Anarchists who deal with it from the standpoint from which they would deal with disputes between individuals or voluntary associations forget that, in the view of the equal-liberty philosophy, States are outlaws and can advance no claims at all on the score of justice. It is utterly absurd to declare that the people of the United States may, in the interest of their own safety, resist a *seizure* by England of Venezuelan territory, but are forbidden by the principle of justice to protect their safety by resisting a *purchase* by England of such territory. This assumes the very thing that Anarchists deny,—namely, the rightful dominion of Venezuela or any other State over a given area. No matter by what method a division of territory between England and Venezuela may be effected, the result must be foreign to justice, for neither is justly entitled to any territory whatever. But since, pending the realization of Anarchism by the abolition of States, the territory of this hemisphere is bound to be under the dominion of thieving nationalities, the people of the United States and especially the Anarchists may very properly do everything in their power to secure such a distribution of this dominion as will be least dangerous and burdensome to themselves.

I was a little too fast in accepting the statement of Mr. Yarros that I am single "among the progressive newspapers and thinkers in the country" in my antagonism to England's attitude in the Venezuelan matter. I have heard no word of protest from any reader of Liberty against the position which I have taken, and, on the other hand, I have received several evidences of approval. And now comes the "Open Court,"—for which Mr. Yarros has often written and which I have always understood him to hold in higher respect than any progressive newspaper in this country save Liberty,—and takes square ground in favor of Cleveland's policy. Its entire issue of January 16 is devoted to the subject, M. D. Conway opposing the president, and Prof. E. D. Cope and the editor, Dr. Paul Carus, strongly sustaining him. Again, "Paragraphs," the new Boston addition to the progressive press, though avowedly anti-Jingo, approves the Venezuelan message; though I must add that it does not seem to have a clear appreciation of the situation. It follows Cleveland in his weak contention—a serious flaw in his policy, which congress possibly will rectify—that this country should allow European powers to acquire this hemisphere by purchase. The Monroe doctrine, so modified, would be a very barren and uninteresting matter, and would contribute to the demolition of its own *raison d'être*. Nevertheless "Paragraphs" counts one on the Cleveland side. Perhaps at the end Mr. Yarros will be a little lonely.

In the "International Journal of Ethics," Dr. William James tries to prove that in faith and hope alone can men find the strength needed to support the burdens of this earthly existence. A delicious illustration is given in the following passage: "A dog whom they are vivisecting in a laboratory lies strapped upon a board and shrieking at his executioners, and to his own dark consciousness is literally in a sort of hell. He cannot see a single redeeming ray in the whole business; and yet all these diabolical-seeming events are usually controlled by human intention with which, if his poor benighted mind could only be made to catch a glimpse of them, all that is heroic in him would religiously acquiesce. It is genuinely a process of redemption. Lying on his back on the board there, he is performing a function incalculably higher than any prosperous canine life admits of, and yet, of the whole performance, this function is the one portion that must remain absolutely beyond his ken." Dr. James implies that the only value of dogs is found in their usefulness as subjects for the laboratory, and that *they* have no other existence to hope for. Their life is only worth living, then, if they die for us. Would he hold that human life was worth living if it could be shown that it was designed for the benefit of some other species of beings? If not, he is clearly illogical. If yes, what ground has he for concluding that this is not the case, but that a future and better life awaits *us*? Dr. James's sublime faith would probably desert him if he should fall among cannibals and be roasted by them. He would not dream of the possibility that he was performing a function incalculably higher than any prosperous professorial life admits of. Yet there is nothing impossible, from his standpoint, in that view of the situation.

Comrade John Henry Mackay has been forced to postpone the realization of his plan for an Anarchistic reading-room in Berlin, owing to the increasing aggressions of the German police. A few weeks ago the authorities prohibited the distribution, just outside the Berlin university, of specimen parts of Mackay's "Die Anarchisten," confiscating 222 copies. Yet it is stated, on the authority of Mackay's publisher, that the policeman who confiscated the books had previously tried to persuade the distributing agent to circulate the sheets among the students, assuring him that he could easily dispose of two thousand copies in the university. This policeman seems to have been an *agent provocateur*. However, our comrade is not discouraged. He has just issued in pamphlet form George Schumm's German translation of my "State Socialism and Anarchism," which appeared some years ago in Liberty's German edition, Libertas. The full title in German is "Staatssozialismus und Anarchismus: in wieweit sie übereinstimmen und worin sie sich unterscheiden." The price is twenty pfennig, and Mackay's publisher for this pamphlet is B. Zack, 45 Oppelnerstrasse, Berlin, S. O. This pamphlet ought also to be circulated among German-Americans. Another interesting sign in Germany is the appearance, in a handsome volume of over two hundred pages, of the famous discussion on interest between Bastiat and Proudhon, translated into German by Dr. Arthur Mülberger, under the title "Kapital und Zins."

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 25, 1896.

"*In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel.*" — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

The Right to Privacy.

That celebrated Schuyler statue case, involving the question of the right to privacy, has finally been decided by the New York court of appeals. There is some confusion as to the precise scope of the decision. Some commentators construe it to mean an absolute denial of "the right to privacy," while others assert that the decision merely denies equitable jurisdiction, without questioning the existence of a tort on the part of the defendant and the legal right to privacy.

To briefly recite the facts: Mrs. Schuyler, a quiet and unostentatious philanthropist, who was averse to notoriety in any form and shrank from public comment on her benevolent deeds, died some years ago. A few of her associates organized an association for the purpose of erecting a statue to her as a typical woman philanthropist, but distant relatives of Mrs. Schuyler objected, and brought suit in equity to restrain, by injunction, the erection and exhibition of the proposed memorial. In two courts the complainants were successful. The supreme court held that an individual does not forfeit the right of privacy by becoming a philanthropist, and characterized as audacious and remarkable the course of the voluntary memorial association, which proposed to ignore the known sentiments of Mrs. Schuyler as well as the protests of her living relatives. The case was taken to the court of appeals, with the result that the injunction is set aside and the decision of the lower courts reversed.

What the court really decides is that the living relatives of Mrs. Schuyler have no grounds upon which to ask for an injunction. The case is very interesting from the standpoint of principle, and may be profitably discussed at some length. The gist of the reasoning of the court is contained in the following passage:

> Whatever right of privacy Mrs. Schuyler had died with her. Death deprives us all of right in the legal sense of that term, and, when Mrs. Schuyler died, her own individual right of privacy, whatever it may have been, expired at the same time. The right which survived (however extensive or limited) was a right pertaining to the living only. It is the right of privacy of the living which it is sought to enforce here. A woman like Mrs. Schuyler may very well in her lifetime have been most strongly adverse to any public notice, even if it were of a most flattering nature, regarding her own works or position. She may have been (and the evidence tends most strongly to show that she was) of so modest and retiring a nature that any publicity, during her life, would have been to her most extremely disagreeable and obnoxious. All these feelings died with her. It is wholly incredible that any individual could dwell with feelings of distress or anguish upon the thought that, after his death, those whose welfare he had toiled for in life would inaugurate a project to erect a statue in token of their appreciation of his efforts and in honor of his memory. This applies as well to the most refined and retiring woman as to a public man. It is, therefore, impossible to credit the existence of any real mental injury or distress to a surviving relative grounded upon the idea that the action proposed in honor of his ancestor would have been disagreeable to that ancestor during his life.

It seems, then, that, if the surviving relatives of Mrs. Schuyler could induce the court to credit the existence of mental distress, an injunction would be in order under this very narrow ruling. The court harps on the assumption that no sane or reasonable person can possibly be thrown into mental distress by the contemplation of the fact that a fitting memorial is being exhibited by reputable and honorable people to a dead relative of his. It is hardly necessary to point out that there is no principle back of such a ruling. In each case of the same kind, the court will have to determine whether the alleged existence of mental distress is to be credited, and whether sane and reasonable persons would be injured by the proposed act.

There is nothing in the decision to warrant the inference that the question of sanity or reasonableness would be considered, if the complainant were, not a relative of a deceased subject of a memorial, but the subject herself. Suppose Mrs. Schuyler had tried to enjoin admirers from doing her honor in spite of her aversion to publicity? The court would apparently have credited the existence of mental distress in her, notwithstanding the absurdity of the claim, from the ordinary point of view, that recognition of merit induces mental suffering. Now, if Mrs. Schuyler is dear to her living relatives, what is there incredible in the claim that it is intensely disagreeable to them to contemplate the doing of acts which would have caused suffering to her? Whatever was painful to her would naturally be painful to those who loved her and to whom her memory is dear. If the test is injury to feelings, there is no distinction between the two cases.

Of course, the decision, in its practical effects, is good as far as it goes, but the whole question of the alleged right to privacy ought to receive full consideration. The court tells us that there is no right to privacy after death, but is it sure that there is a right to privacy for the living,—I mean a right consistent with the freedom of speech and non-invasive action? Disgust with the sensationalism of the press leads many into thoughtless and hasty assertions in favor of the alleged right to privacy, just as disgust with certain types of agitators leads many to sympathize with actions or proposals violative of freedom of speech and discussion. The throwing of rotten eggs at Ahlwardt, the anti-Semitic humbug, is condoned by many advanced men simply because they have no patience with his crusade, but it is just as important (if not, indeed, more important) to defend *his* right to agitate as it is to defend the right to free speech of those with whom we are in full accord. The sensationalism of the press is detestable, but it does not follow that its practices can be properly interfered with. From the standpoint of equal freedom, there is no basis whatever for the alleged right to privacy. This will be admitted even by those who follow the law in holding libel and slander to be aggressions. As I am inclined to think that libel and slander cannot strictly be classed among invasive acts at all, it is plain that I am bound to deny absolutely the existence of the right to privacy as a corollary from equal freedom. Privacy is a privilege which men ought to respect for a number of valid reasons, but force may not be invoked to secure its enforcement.

V. Y.

Professor Small's Two Principles.

In the "American Journal of Sociology," the organ of the University of Chicago, the editor, Professor Albion W. Small, publishes an article which appears to many shockingly radical. The present social order is arraigned by Professor Small as inequitable and vicious, and certain vague reformatory propositions are advanced by him which, logically developed, would lead to State Socialism. It is not my intention here to criticise Professor Small's philosophy of society, but a study of his methods and reasoning will be very instructive to those who imagine that professors of sociology necessarily think or mean something when they discourse on their favorite subjects.

Professor Small starts out by pointing out two principles which serve him as a test in judging societies. "The present social system," he says, "or the reorganizations that may follow each other in its place, will be justified or condemned according to their success in providing for at least these two postulates of human association,"—namely, "the essential similarity of all human beings in capacity for happiness," and that "private business, like public office, is a public trust." Proceeding to analyze the present order, Professor Small finds that neither of these principles is duly observed or applied, and hence concludes that evolution is bound to bring about a radical change.

To prove that the first of his principles is violated, Professor Small points to the poverty, ignorance, involuntary idleness, dependence, and insecurity of millions of workmen. The condition of the masses, he says, clearly shows that, whatever our creed may be, society has not yet learned to recognize the essential similarity of all human beings in capacity for happiness. "Wage slavery," according to him, is inconsistent with this principle, and the modern social problem is "how to socialize ourselves to such degree that, without bankrupting all, each may have a secure lien upon a minimum share of nature's endowment for satisfying common human wants."

Let us look into this "principle." What is meant by the proposition that all human beings are essentially similar in their capacity for happiness? Surely not that all human beings have *equal* capacities for happiness; that would be obviously untrue. It must mean, then, that

we are similar in that each of us has *some* capacity for happiness. But, if this is what the imposing phrase really means, it is not true that society has failed to recognize it. Theoretically there is no a sane individual who would deny it, while, so far as social practice is concerned, Professor Small has fallen far short of proving his allegation that society has violated this principle. He has not shown that society has done something, or has been guilty of a neglect to do something, amounting to deprivation of the masses of happiness, or of the right or opportunity to happiness. It is true that those who are poor, or idle through no fault of their own, or insecure in their means of livelihood, are not happy; but whose duty is it to make them happy? Professor Small indicts society for maintaining institutions which make some men dependent upon the arbitrary will of other men, but he has omitted to prove the duty of society to make everybody happy. In fact, he has nowhere displayed consciousness of the vital distinction between the freedom to do a thing and the actual doing of the thing. Back of his principle, there must be a higher principle from which the functions of society and the rights of the individual are deducible. Professor Small attempts to erect his structure without any foundation at all.

But let us see whether Professor Small's "principle" would be realized in the order he would substitute for the present one. He would guarantee each a secure lien upon a minimum share of nature's endowments for the satisfaction of common human wants. Would that necessarily mean full recognition of the essential similarity of all men in their capacity for happiness? By no means. Who would determine the minimum? And why a minimum for some, and more than a minimum for others? Who would decide that a particular individual's capacity for happiness is satisfied by his share of nature's endowment? Suppose a man is unhappy in spite of his minimum, and protests that his case proves society's culpability in failing to recognize the "principle"? More questions of this kind could easily be added, but it would be superfluous. The arbitrary and superficial character of Professor Small's distinctions is sufficiently illustrated.

With regard to Professor Small's second principle little needs to be said. That "private business is a public trust" is a proposition so delightfully vague that any interpretation can be made to fit it. It may mean nothing, and it may mean too much. Upholders of the present order might properly claim that the requirements of ordinary honesty and legality fully satisfy this "principle," while demi-State Socialists may claim that an indefinite number of further restrictions upon private powers and interests is necessary. No test, no limit, is given whereby we might determine whether any particular restrictive measure is justified by the public interest in private business. Nor does this "principle" enable one to meet the contention of the State Socialists that no harmony is possible between private business and public interests, and that therefore the former ought to be done away with and merged in public business.

Professor Small objects to the label State Socialist, and asks that he be judged by his own teachings. His spirit and tendencies *are* State Socialistic, however, and he simply lacks the intellectual acumen or the courage to reduce his nebulous notions to scientific definiteness. Thoughtless conservatives regard him as a radical, but he is entirely harmless. As for the radicals, they have not tumbled over one another in their eagerness to claim him. They want clear ideas, definite propositions, while the new school of American so-called sociologists (of-the-Chair) is chiefly remarkable for emptiness and brainlessness.

V. Y.

For some time Liberty has had, I think, the distinction of charging for itself a price which, considering the size of the sheet and the quantity of its contents, exceeds that placed upon any other periodical of similar circulation. This distinction it enjoys no longer, having to yield it to a new publication started in Boston under the name of "Paragraphs." That is, "Paragraphs" is the main part of its title. Read in full, the title constitutes a considerable portion of the periodical itself, being: "Paragraphs of Appreciation and Depreciation." The February number, which is the first, consists of twelve pages of yellowish blotting-paper, the page being seven and one-half inches by three and containing a short and narrow column of paragraphs. In all there are less than five thousand words of reading-matter,—about equal to two and one-half pages of Liberty. As the price is five cents a copy,—against eight cents charged for Liberty, which contains about fourteen thousand words,—"Paragraphs" costs the reader nearly twice as much as Liberty. I consider this a point in "Paragraphs'" favor, especially if the quality is satisfactory. And the quality is amply guaranteed by the fact that the editor and sole writer of "Paragraphs" is Mr. W. D. Forrest, who is well known to the readers of Liberty as having in the past contributed to its columns much that was pungent and poetical. If the work of his pen has not been seen in these columns during the past year, he can best explain why. All that I know is that, at the time when he sent his last batch of "copy," he accompanied it with a letter gravely setting forth the ludicrous charge that I had been guilty of a breach of trust in having (as he mistakenly supposed) stated to another party that he (Forrest) was a subscriber to Liberty. Remembering the brevity of life, I did not trouble myself to reply even that Mr. Forrest was wrong in his facts, to say nothing of his ethics; and since I have not heard from him. The state of his mind in the meantime may be best described, I imagine, by a sentence which he quotes feelingly in his first number from the Dutch of Vandervood: "To live is easy enough; but to live and keep quiet, ah! that is difficult." So we have "Paragraphs." I am glad of it. It is bright, if light. To those who are fond of eating, as often as once a month, a literary dinner consisting wholly of dessert I extend this advice: Take "Paragraphs." They can get it by sending fifty cents for a year's subscription to W. D. Forrest, P. O. Box 1593, Boston, Mass.

A recently-published English book on "Economics and Socialism" makes the claim that it embodies "the truth" which had eluded all previous thinkers. The "truth" turns out to be a mixture of Single-Taxism, anti-trades-unionism, and alleged currency reform. The author, Mr. Laycock, would tax land values, abolish labor organizations, and charge for coining gold at the mint. These reforms, he says, would abolish poverty and solve the social problem. The land reform is advocated on theological and moral grounds, while the other two ingredients of "the truth" are favored for purely economic reasons. It is amusing to reflect how many there are who imagine themselves to be original discoverers and thinkers with no better basis for the fancy than a few platitudes and one or two blunders!

Edgar Fawcett, in writing about Ingersoll in "The Conservator," resents the disposition of some persons to emphasize the colonel's gift as an orator. He thinks that more attention ought to be paid to the substance of Ingersoll's teaching. Mr. Fawcett finds the "essence of wisdom and mental power" in Ingersoll's matter, and he is delighted and convinced by it. Well, how about Ingersoll's opinions on protection, government, finance, and the glories of the Republican party? Do *they* contain the essence of wisdom? Mr. Fawcett is an ardent admirer of Spencer, but he seems to be imperfectly acquainted with Spencer's sociology. Spencer would regard Ingersoll's opinions on the topics mentioned as the quintessence of folly and ignorance. Which of these is Mr. Fawcett's real guide and master? He cannot follow both.

Professor Small, of the Chicago University, has an article in the official journal of that institution, in which the present society is arraigned and condemned as inequitable and revolting, and reform along the lines of some form of collectivism is declared inevitable. Many superficial people see in this radical article evidence of absolute freedom of teaching in the Chicago University. But it proves no such thing. Bemis was not dismissed for radicalism, but for explicitness and definiteness. Reform talk, if but sufficiently vague, is not offensive. Prof. Small does not indicate any practical steps towards reform, and, in fact, does not know of any, according to his own admission. Plutocrats do not quarrel with merely pious opinions and wishes.

Another huge corporation, the Tobacco Trust, is in trouble. What government prosecutions and judicial anathemas have utterly failed to do, the ordinary laws of trade, even under the present highly imperfect conditions as to competition, have finally brought about. Trusts are not as formidable even to-day as they are popularly supposed to be, while under real freedom they could not exist, literally, for a single day. The certainty of competition would cripple them at the start.

"Freedom" welcomes that "excellent little paper," the "Firebrand," and hopes that its appearance indicates a *revival* of Anarchism in the United States. Well, "Freedom" is not much better than the "Firebrand" nowadays, and the compliments are natural. How any man of sense can read either, or how any movement can be proud of such exponents, passes comprehension.

Occupancy AND Use.

After the usual intermission for refreshments, Mr. Byington and I renew in this issue our discussion of the land question, which the disconcerted reader may trace back, if he chooses, through Nos. 324 and 308, to a much remoter past.

I can readily forgive my friend for mistaking B for A in my answer to his question. Such a slip the most careful man may make at any time. But his more fundamental misconception of what the occupancy-and-use doctrine really is I find it more difficult, if not to pardon, at least to account for. Certainly in no writing of mine have I given him warrant for supposing me to hold that a man should be allowed a title to as much of the earth as he, in the course of his life, with the aid of all the workmen that he can employ, may succeed in covering with buildings. It is occupancy *and* use that Anarchism regards as the basis of land ownership,—not occupancy *or* use, as Mr. Byington seems to have understood. A man cannot be allowed, merely by putting labor, to the limit of his capacity and beyond the limit of his personal use, into material of which there is a limited supply and the use of which is essential to the existence of other men, to withhold that material from other men's use; and any contract based upon or involving such withholding is as lacking in sanctity or legitimacy as a contract to deliver stolen goods. As I have never held that freedom of contract includes a right to dispose of the property of others, I do not, in denying such right, "yield the sanctity of contract," as Mr. Byington puts it. Yes, the object of Anarchism is, sure enough, to let every man "control self and the results of self-exertion"; but this by no means implies that a man may store upon another's land the results of his self-exertion. If a man exerts himself by erecting a building on land which afterward, by the operation of the principle of occupancy and use, rightfully becomes another's, he must, upon the demand of the subsequent occupant, remove from this land the results of his self-exertion, or, failing so to do, sacrifice his property right therein. The man who persists in storing his property on another's premises is an invader, and it *is* his *crime* that alienates his control of this property. He is "fined one house," not "for building a house and then letting another man live in it," but for invading the premises of another. If there were nothing in the "Beauties of Government" to beat that, then indeed would government be a really beautiful thing.

The objection advanced by Mr. Byington that adherence to this principle must cause a degree of embarrassment to persons desirous of using an entire edifice for a period too short to warrant building or buying has some validity, and should be accorded all the weight that properly belongs to it. But its gravity is insufficient to balance that of the considerations in the other scale. It must be remembered that comparatively few persons desire to rent an *entire* building for a *short* time. As a rule, those who want quarters for a short time prefer parts of buildings, and there is nothing in the occupancy-and-use plan to prevent them from realizing their desire. As a rule, again, those who want an entire building want it for a long time, and therefore can afford to build or buy. The exceptional person who does not come under these heads will undoubtedly have to pay something for the realization of his exceptional desires. He will have to make it worth the while of the occupying owner of the desired building to part with it; that is to say, he will have to buy the building at something above its normal value. Perhaps, to avoid the embarrassment of looking for a purchaser at the expiration of the time for which he desires the building, he will be able to effect a contract with the seller whereby the latter shall agree to buy back the building at a given date at its normal value. If the seller should fail to keep this agreement, the building would still be the property of the buyer, and he could sell it to another party. The difference between the buying and the selling price might not exceed the rent exacted for such buildings under the present *régime*. But, assuming that these exceptional persons would be, for occasional brief periods, under a greater burden in this respect than at present, this could not offset the far more important fact that the great body of people would be occupying their own buildings, paying no rent for their use and no interest on the money with which they were built. The entire race's steady and imperative need of free access to the land cannot be subordinated to the occasional convenience of a small fraction of the race.

The adjustment of the conditions upon which an occupant and user can secure his premises against being considered as abandoned while he is on a vacation or a visit, or of the conditions upon which an occupying owner who desires to sell may hold his property while seeking a purchaser, or of the conditions upon which a man who builds houses, not to rent, but to sell, may likewise be accommodated in his search for purchasers, is a mere matter of human device or administrative detail, not to be discussed in these columns unless the attempt be to show that such device is impossible.

Probably my language regarding ground-floor occupants was not sufficiently clear. In my assertion that they would own *both land and store* the intended emphasis was on the words here italicized, and I neglected to consider the fact that not all occupying owners would, on erecting a building, prefer to occupy the ground floor themselves, my view being colored by the knowledge that retail druggists, apropos of whom my point was made, so far as I have observed, do business on the ground floor. It was not in my mind at all to deny that a registered occupying owner would lose his claim to protection of his title should he choose to personally occupy only the attic of his building. It would be required only that he should occupy and use some portion or portions practically equal to the ground floor in area. It is probable that in an occupancy-and-use system there would be many cases of rent-paying by tenants of rooms or floors. But the amount of this rent would be greatly influenced by the competition that would prevail in consequence of the freeing of unused land, and the ability to build with non-interest-bearing capital that free money would insure, as well as by the non-intervention of the protective association in the relations of owner and tenant. I question whether, under such circumstances, the rent that could be obtained would often much exceed the loss through wear and tear and care of the premises rented.

In his present remarks about price-cutting and its relation to rent Mr. Byington leaves entirely out of the account the element of competition on which my argument rests. Does he suppose that there is any sharply competitive trade in existence in which the tradesman does not constantly ask himself the question how he can manage to lower his prices in order to secure some of the patronage that is going to his competitors? And does he suppose that, in considering this problem, this tradesman fails to ask himself if he cannot reduce his expenses and thereby manage to lower his prices? And is not rent one of these expenses? And, if it were lifted from his shoulders, would he not lower his prices at once? And, if he did, would not his competitor, who has all the time been doing business in a building of his own and paying rent to nobody, be forced to lower his prices also in order to retain his trade,—a thing which now he does not have to do because his rent-paying competitor cannot lower his prices? It is as clear as daylight.

The man who builds a cage over a sleeper prevents the sleeper from exercising his unquestionable right to *step off* of premises that belong to another, and therefore is an invader. The man who becomes by occupancy and use the owner of a previously unoccupied, unimproved, and unused passage, and in the exercise of his ownership blocks the passage, simply prevents other men from doing what they have no right to do,—that is, *step on* to premises that belong to another,—and therefore is not an invader.

Mr. Byington's answer to my contention that there may be circumstances under which it is advisable to do violence to equal freedom amounts in its conclusion to a statement that no evil can be as disastrous as an act of invasion; that justice should be done though the heavens fall, for a precedent of injustice would lead to a worse disaster than the falling of the heavens; and that, if he were the guardian of a city most of whose inhabitants found themselves under the necessity of a choice between death by fire on the one hand and death by drowning on the other, he would not relieve them from this choice if he could do so only by violating the property rights of a portion of his fellow-citizens. Discussion is hopeless here. T.

George Bernard Shaw carries his constitutionalism a little too far. In discussing, in his own happy fashion, the conventional methods of solving dramatic situations involving the question of marriage and adulterous love, he says, after pointing out the growing practicability of unconventional relations, that he must not be understood as suggesting "anarchical violations of our marriage laws rather than an orderly agitation for constitutional reform of them in harmony with the higher morality of our own time." Why this disclaimer? Mr. Shaw has repeatedly stated that his sympathies are Anarchistic, and that he would abandon his State Socialism if he was convinced that "rent" could be equitably distributed under economic freedom. Having no faith in competition as a solvent of monopoly and inequality, it is not unnatural for Mr. Shaw to favor State interference with industrial relations.

But what has "rent" to do with the freedom of love and sexual relations? Why should he deprecate "anarchical violations of our marriage laws"? Surely he has no superstitious reverence for mere legal forms and fictions. And yet from what other standpoint does he deride what he calls the "aimlessly rebellious crusade against marriage altogether"?

When the Philadelphia strike was at its height, the director of public safety requested the saloon-keepers of the city to close their doors, and they obeyed him, notwithstanding the fact that he could not have enforced his request. A number of sapient editors see in that incident a great argument in favor of high license,—that being the Philadelphia liquor system. Under low license, they say, it would have been impossible to secure obedience to such a request. This is a fair sample of editorial acumen. The deeper and wider aspects of the question are entirely lost sight of, and the many serious objections to high license which have long been familiar are passed over. This is the way all our problems are settled by newspapers: what wonder is it that the country is in a state of political and economic chaos? It is rather strange that editors are not demanding a law compelling saloons to close on strike days. Here is an excellent chance for a Prohibition organ. It cannot be shown, perhaps, that "rum" has defeated any particular strike, but that is immaterial.

A few weeks ago the "Evening Post" was confidently asserting that our currency troubles were due to a redundancy of money which pressed down rates of discount and interest and drove gold out of the country. Now it tells us that the new government loan is a forced loan in reality, since the banks do not want to invest in the bonds, being able to employ the money more actively and profitably by discounting commercial paper and accommodating their ordinary customers. How about the redundancy of the currency, then? And, if the currency is not redundant, what is the cause of our financial embarrassments? Godkin and White are the leading champions of the gold basis, and the editor of the "Engineering Magazine" thinks that they have said the last word on finance. How does he explain their inability to remain consistent for a single week? In the last few months they have advanced half a dozen contradictory and mutually exclusive explanations of the present financial situation.

An investigation of the police department in Philadelphia resulted in disclosures fully as startling (to the innocent) as those of the memorable Lexow investigation in New York. Corruption, alliance with crime, protection of vice for pay, and so on, were proved against the force, and the Republican papers of this overwhelmingly Republican city have not ventured to challenge the general verdict. It is safe to say that no city of any size can be found whose police force is not equally treacherous and criminal. Yet the faith in the necessity and utility of the police seems to be as firm as ever.

A bill has been introduced in congress to protect American workmen by prohibiting immigration of all laborers, skilled or unskilled. The Republican party of California is said to father this extraordinary measure. It cannot be denied that it is a logical extension of the protectionist idea, and it would not be strange were organized labor to demand the prohibition of immigration. It is to its credit that the idea receives no support in trade unions. A country which has excluded Chinese labor may see fit to go to the length of barring out all foreign labor. Such an act would not, however, prevent the fools and the hypocrites from claiming that this is the freest and most enlightened country in the world. The bill will not pass, simply because labor does not clamor for it and there is no politics in the thing.

A movement for the reduction of street railway fares in Chicago is antagonized by the Single Taxers on the ground that no benefit would accrue to the people, such reductions merely redounding to the profits of landlords. This is strictly logical from the standpoint of single-tax economics, which, of course, does not prevent it from being absurd. The Single Taxer sees only one enemy, the landlord; and the social problem presents itself to him as a very simple thing. To be entirely consistent, he ought to oppose all reductions in the price of food, clothing, and other necessaries of life. What Single Taxers fail to perceive is the complexity of human relations. This failure betrays them into numberless blunders, great and small.

Referring to the discussion by the New York chamber of commerce of plans for taking the saloon out of politics, the "Voice" boldly says: "We will give a certified check for $10,000 to the man who will contrive any way to take the saloon out of politics without taking it out of existence." Liberty claims the check. It has repeatedly demonstrated that it is possible to take the saloon out of politics without destroying it. That way is—absolute non-interference with the liquor trade. Let anybody who chooses open a saloon and sell liquor at any time he pleases. This will keep all liquor dealers, big and little, out of politics. The "Voice" is not willing to try this method; so let it not swagger and pretend to have checks ready for successful competitors.

Judge Pryor, of New York, declines to issue naturalization papers to applicants who are ignorant of the Monroe doctrine. If there were a law denaturalizing Americans for similar ignorance, nine out of every ten would find themselves "countryless."

The "Voice," which was so down on Rev. F. M. Foster for opposing majority rule, now can't see how "the fact that the Uitlanders outnumber the Boers is sufficient reason for giving them equal rights with the latter."

Chicago Single Taxers vehemently assert that their movement is essentially religious, and they frown on attempts to deal with it as an economic affair pure and simple. Would all Single Taxers were so regardful of their traditions and early teaching! There is nothing more wonderful than single-tax theology and metaphysics; even women temperance associations may yet see fit to adopt a single-tax plank. I profoundly sympathize with the progressive minority in the single-tax ranks. With their materialism, individualism, and healthy abhorrence of cant, their position must be very trying.

The Governors and the Governed.

WASHINGTON, JAN. 14.—Society people here are remarking that the display of diamonds at the president's reception Thursday evening was more extensive than any that has been witnessed at the national capital since the administration of President Arthur, when the jewels of New York and Philadelphia were brought here to be exhibited upon the necks of fair women. Mrs. Scott Townsend is said to have made the finest display Thursday evening, her new necklace of pure white stones nearly as large as chestnuts being worn for the first time. The widow of Senator Hearst was also noticeable for her remarkable jewels, and it is said that some of them came from Mrs. Stanford's collection. Mrs. Dominguez, wife of the *charge d'affaires* of the Argentine Republic, ranked next for the abundance and beauty of her diamonds and pearls. She was a San Francisco girl and a daughter of one of the bonanza silver kings.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., JAN. 14.—A small riot took place at the city hall this morning. Men in want, to the number of twenty-five, are given work for three days at a time, shoveling snow for the city. To-day about two hundred men applied. The poor overseer tried to make selections by lot, when those failing to draw tickets set upon him, tore his clothing off, and handled him roughly. The police interfered to prevent further violence.

The Enemy of Man.

Long time ago, when men were weak,
  And animals were big and strong,
They say it was a narrow squeak
  For any one to get along;
But *now* what must the trouble be?
No vengeful quadrupeds have we,
Save those that we may go to see
  For fifty cents.—What can be wrong?

Back to the shades primeval fled
  The wolf, the panther, and the bear,
Of Man, the Terror, more in dread
  Than he of them; and everywhere
Bright Nature hailed the conqueror
Who was to make fond love to her;
Considering what *did* occur,
  The outlook was exceeding fair.

And yet,—go ask of Mother Earth
  What things have taken place since then:
Fire, falsehood, famine, sword, and ruth,
  A globe thick-sown with murdered men.
Go read the Martyrdom of Man,
And hold your anger, if you can,
Or sorrow; though the better plan
  Were to think hard on what has been.

O bearer of the diamond crown!
  There's blood upon the gems you wear;
Unseen by you it drips adown
  And clots upon your shoulders fair.
A crippled, starved, and plundered race
(The sacrifice to frame your face)
The fearful load, the slave's disgrace,
  May, sometime, fail to calmly bear.

And if we infidels are wrong,
  And there *does* come a Day of Doom,
It will not take Him very long
  To say who'll make Hell's furnace boom:
The ones who drive us to disease,
Who, needless, make us fight and freeze
And risk our lives in stormy seas,
  The desert's drought, the mine's deep gloom.

Hush! tell it not in Gath, nor let
  Be known from Beersheba to Dan,
The fact that's not made public yet,
  Against which lies a special ban;
But I will whisper just to you
A thing I think you never knew,
A verity,—alas! *too* true:
  Man's only enemy is MAN!

William Walstein Gordak.

"Es ist Strengstens Untersagt."

From the note-book of an American tourist in Germany.

[The Century.]

A Yankee in Deutschland declared:
"I know a fine Fräulein here;
Of the Bangor girls she's the peer.
I'll wed her at once," he declared.
"Oh, no!" said the Polizei.
Said the Yankee, "Why?"
"You cannot at once be wed,
It is strengthily undersaid;
You first must be measured and weighed, and then
Tell where you were born, and why, and when.

Then the Yankee in Deutschland declared:
"Well, instead we will go on a spin
Through the beautiful streets of Berlin
On our 'bike,'" the Yankee declared.
"Oh, no!" said the Polizei.
Said the Yankee, "Why?"
"You cannot go cycling instead,
It is strengthily undersaid;
You first must be measured and weighed, and then
Tell where you would wheel, and why, and when."

Then the Yankee in Deutschland declared:
"Never mind, we'll go to the play,
Your pretty new hat to display.
It is worth it," the Yankee declared.
"Oh, no!" said the Polizei.
Said the Yankee, "Why?"
"We object to the hat on the head,
It is strengthily undersaid;
It first must be measured and weighed, and then
Tell where it was made, and why, and when."

Then the Yankee in Deutschland declared:
"If one must forever be worried
Like this, he had better be buried,
And be done with it!" he declared.
"Oh, no!" said the Polizei.
Said the Yankee, "Why?"
"If you do, we will break your head,
For it's strengthily undersaid;
You first must be measured and weighed, and then
Tell why you were born at all, and when,
And promise never to do it again."
Said the Yankee, "Which?" and "Why?"
"Both," answered the Polizei.

G. W. R.

The Occupancy-and-Use Doctrine.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I try not to make myself a bigger fool than my neighbors, but I do once in a while break the record in that line. I seem to have done so when I read "A" for "B" in your answer to my question. I admire your forbearance in printing the column of inapplicable stuff I wrote under that misunderstanding,—or, indeed, in consenting to continue the discussion at all with one who carries it on in such a way.

But, though that column of rhetoric appears to have been fired in the air, I can write as good a column about what you really said. In the first place, it makes me wonder what the ground of the principle of land tenure by occupancy and use can be. I had understood that the owner of improved land held his title to it by virtue of his ownership of the improvements, that the user without improvement held it by his ownership of his own person or movable property situated on it, and that, if he left it absolutely unoccupied over night, any one who could put an improvement on it in that time might have it. But now it appears that the principle of occupancy is of such force that this tenure of land not only disregards, in certain cases, the ownership of labor products, but even has force to transfer the ownership of a labor product from one person to another without contract or the payment of an equivalent. Nay, even the sanctity of contract, which I never thought to see you yield, gives way before the sanctity of occupancy and use; for there is no possible conception of renting a house that does not include a contract by which the house is to be regarded as still the landlord's property, and is to revert to his possession at the expiration (however that may be determined) of the lease. But, in the teeth of the contract and of all other rights of property, the landlord's ownership of both house and lot is annulled the moment he yields possession of them to a tenant.

Well, if this is Anarchism, I don't know paternal legislation when I see it. I supposed that the object of Anarchism was to let every man "control self and the results of self-exertion"; that it proposed to attain this end by letting nothing but crime or contract alienate a man's claim to control either of these things; and that it could never be a crime to demand the fulfilment of any contract, freely entered into between two citizens of the Anarchistic society, regarding the ownership or possession of property. But here it is provided that, when one has produced for himself certain property,—to wit, a house,—and then has entered into a contract with another by which the other is to have the use of that property for a limited period (the ownership remaining with the producer, and the possession reverting to him at a day set, or whenever the user shall fail to make a certain periodical payment), and when the producer has begun faithfully to perform his part of the contract by yielding possession of the house, then his non-invasive actions, apparently useful and friendly, shall be punished by the transfer of the ownership of that house to another person, who shall be protected against any attempt on the producer's part to recover the property. He is fined one house for the crime of building a house and then letting another man live in it, the fine being made payable to the *particeps criminis*. Was there ever anything in your "Beauties of Government" to beat that?

I note a further surprising implication, which I never dreamed of before. Unused land, if usable,—even, as the context shows, if occupied by improvements,—will not remain idle, for "any one would be free to take it." I had supposed that the owner of a house could keep the house empty if he chose so to do; but I see I am wrong. His ownership in the house, a labor product, lapses as soon as he removes his person (and his movable property? I don't know) from it.

Certainly it cannot be denied that this will be a vexatious restriction on useful business. You yourself point out that it will put an end to the business of renting houses, so that the man who wants to have the use of a house for one year must buy a house, and then trust his luck to find a purchaser at the end of the year. This inconvenience will be a decided obstruction to every form of business that requires for its most convenient transaction the temporary occupancy of a shop, or temporary residence in any place. To be sure, in the latter case, he can rent rooms in a house occupied by others; but, if he happens to prefer having a house to himself, the necessity of giving up his preference is an obstruction to his business. All this is clear without considering that the man who leaves home for any length of time must first find a purchaser for his house, since it will become another's property if he either rents it or leaves it vacant, and the man who buys a house in which he will stay only one year must, for the same reason, find a purchaser to take it *at once* on his departure. (But this will be made easier by the reduction in the supply of houses, consequent on the fact that no one can afford to build a house for sale unless he is prepared to occupy it till a purchaser appears, even though the purchaser be unexpectedly slow in appearing. Still, the man whose circumstances require him to sell at a certain time is likely to get bitten in the price.)

You answer in advance one question that I should otherwise have asked, when you tell me that, where the stories of a building are occupied by different persons, the ground floor man is to own the land. Thus, for instance, the druggist in the "Sun" building owns the land under his store, and the "Sun," which occupies three stories (I believe) above him, has no right in it. Just how the fact that he is next the earth should make his one story constitute more of an occupancy than the "Sun's" three is not clear to my muddled head; neither am I certain what will follow if it turns out that somebody else occupies the cellar under him. I note, however, an occasion for partially retracting my confession that my expostulation under point 5 in No. 324 was unprovoked; for all who occupy sites above the ground floor are left still paying rent to their landlord. This includes a very large body of business; and, since the market does not separate land-rent from house-rent, they will be paying both. It seems to me that this justifies considerable parts of my complaint on the poor tenant's behalf.

My answer about "those drug-stores" is now embodied in my "puerile question" about the fact that traders on their own land do not now undersell those who pay rent. You ask if I am "really unaware that the man who uses that which he could lend to another for a price insists on getting as much profit . . . as he would get if he should lend it." No, I am not unaware of that; I am only unaware that it has anything to do with what we are talking about. Are you really unaware that that maxim is simply a particular case of a very broad principle,—to wit, that men generally try to get all that they think they can out of whatever they have; that the druggist who occupied a good site rent free would not lower his prices unless he expected to make more money in that way than by keeping them up; and that the druggist on a good site of his own would now lower his prices if he expected to make more by that than by keeping them up? Or have you in mind some way by which price-cutting is to be made more profitable to this man then than now? The fact is that high rents, or any other expense, may drive a man out of business, but, as long as he is in business, they can never prevent him from making the same cuts in price that he would make if those expenses did not exist. If he expects a given cut to increase his profits, he will make it, however high his expenses; if he expects it to decrease them, he will not make it, however low his expenses. And the amount of any expense can never affect the amount of profit to be gained from a cut in price unless that cut will affect the amount of that expense.

The rest of our points can be dismissed with a few words. I asked you what was the difference between the man who builds a cage over a sleeper and the man who blocks a passage, that one should be an invader and the other not. You reply by reassuring me that one is an invader and the other not, but give no explanation of the ground of the distinction. My question still awaits an answer.

As to the question whether the law of equal freedom can be obeyed in the face of a conflagration, when people object to the blowing-up of their houses to stop the flames,—supposing also that more than an isolated house here and there is inhabited by persons who have not bound themselves to any defensive association by a contract requiring them to yield their property for the common need in such extreme emergencies, though this is hardly a probable supposition,—I should, in the first place, have it understood that those whose houses were sacrificed were entitled to a compensation at least equal to the value of their chance of escape if not blown up. As a juryman, I would give them that in the absence of previous contract on the subject; as chief of the fire department, I would offer in advance several times that. This would make all reasonable owners consent, and I should assume every owner's consent if I didn't hear from him. If he protested, I should move on to the next house, without stopping for argument, and leave him to take his chances with the fire. If the flames were coming on faster than I could carry my powder from block to block, I should not be trying to stop them in that way. If the protest was delayed—whether by the owner's fault or not—till the powder was already in the house, I should tell him that we, acting as his silence justified us in acting, had created a commodity of placed powder in which, it being the product of our lawful labor, we claimed such property rights as we could not afford to waive, so we would use it. (That is, I'd tell him that next day when I had time.) Finally, if the recalcitrants were so very numerous as to break up the zone of defence, I should grin and bear it for sweet Anarchy's sake, as a lesser evil than the establishment of a governmental precedent,—taking notice at the same time that I was very likely to be mistaken about the necessity of the demolition, since so many seemed convinced of its needlessness.

As to my collecting your share of rent, you still claim nothing that I did not intend to concede, I think. As to Miss Musson's answer to the same problem, based on the proposition that we "cannot prove separate rights to the rent, but only aggregated rights," it seems to me that this proposition is directly contrary to Henry George's argument in "A Perplexed Philosopher," part 1, ch. 4; and since, so far as I know, Single Taxers generally gave special applause to this point of George's, Miss Musson's article does not seem to be orthodox Single Tax doctrine.

If she writes again, I hope she will comment on the passage where she bids us "collect the whole rental value and then return it to the community in maintenance of equal freedom, by making and maintaining public highways and by protection of life and property." I am surprised to learn that street-paving is part of the maintenance of equal freedom, and almost equally surprised to learn that all economic rent can profitably be spent on police and the care of streets.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A Winter Scene.

Translated by Benj R. Tucker from the French of Octave Mirbeau in "Le Journal," and dedicated by the translator to the sportsman of the Free Socialist party, J. Wm. Lloyd.

The other day I was invited to a hunt. I am not a hunter; I am even what might be called an anti-hunter. But I resolved, nevertheless, to accept this invitation and to be on hand with my cane.

We left Paris early in the morning, from the Saint Lazare station. It was a curious sight. In order to get into the waiting room, we had to stride over prostrate bodies, the bodies of poor Italian emigrants who slept rolled in their rags waiting for the exile train. Cadaverous faces, frames emaciated by hunger and misery, pitiful game beaten up and hunted down by cynegetes of human flesh who will finally destroy upon Sicilian soil even the memory of man, destined in that country to become a scientific curiosity, a museum ornament, like the mammoth and the ichthyosaurus.

In the waiting room were some thirty travellers,—all hunters,—provided with leather cases, wearing leather boots, and begirt with leather straps from which nets hung like scalps. The collars of their fur overcoats were turned up to meet their soft hats, so that nothing was visible of their faces except terrible beards and disorderly masses of fear-inspiring hair. Evidently the mountaineer Teodrog, with the white skin, or the dark lake dweller Rob Sen, so fancifully evoked by J. H. Rosny in his admirable "Erimah," looked not unlike these. And to see them in their hides and furs and hair, pacing the room with long resounding strides, their nostrils already scenting the game, their eyes searching the thickets where sleeps the prey, their arms describing in advance the gestures of massacre, carried one back to fabulous prehistoric times when man fought in furious combat the tiger *spelæus*, the *urus*, and the wolf. They were talking with each other, and their almost incomprehensible language, a slang of the Quaternary period, made up of hoarse or hissing articulations, varied barks, and chromatic howls, was not calculated to efface the impression that I was gazing upon beings escaped from the lake-dwellings of Switzerland or the caves of Ariège. As far as I could gather verbal meaning from this scarcely shaded gutturalism, I understood that they were recounting their exploits of the previous week, their great victories over the hares, the partridges, and the formidable sky-larks. And I too had a vision, swift but clear, of the great lakes and virgin forests where our ancestors, clad in the skins of beasts, celebrated with the same eloquence the death of the *urus* and of the antelope *rupicapra*.

In the railway carriage into which we crammed ourselves, the conversation—if the term conversation may be applied to such an exchange of discordant cries, recalling those of the *urus*, the stag, the black bear, and the lømmergejer—turned upon the subject of poachers. The clamor was so loud and so unanimously vociferous that we had to open the windows, in spite of the cold, for we could no longer understand each other, and it was to be feared that the partitions of the railway carriage would no longer resist such a cyclone of wrath. Each, and all at once, their beards more hairy, their furs more ruffled, their boots and belts and cases animated by a more furious hatred, they proposed bloody laws, punishments, quarterings, extra Chinese tortures, against poachers who deprive hunters of the pleasure of a vaster butchery, the joy of a completer massacre.

One of them gave utterance to this idea, which I translate into a known tongue:

"Why doesn't the government authorize us to hunt poachers? Why don't the police pay for the paws of a dead poacher, as they do for those of wolves? Why doesn't the Pasteur institute sell vials which would spread fatal and infectious diseases among the poachers, as it does for the field-mice?"

Each interrogation was greeted by all the other hunters with approving shouts and furious tallyhos, which drowned the rattle of the train and the whistle of the locomotive.

But now we are in the fields. There are clouds in the sky; a sharp and icy wind is blowing from the north-west. A dirty fog is falling on the hillsides, enveloping the region in an indescribable sadness. The hunters go forward, crushing the sods and turning up the sowings of rye and wheat with their boot-heels. Their guns in their hands, they proceed with watchful eyes and quivering nostrils, at regular distances from one another. I have selected my hunter, an immense person of the dolichocephalic type, with a black beard, and harnessed as if for a merciless war; and I walk by his side. With every step that he takes on the soft soil he destroys the sprouting wheat; against the wheat, whose frail shoots are hardly green as yet, he seems to have a spite; and he insults the sparrows that rise at his approach, and in gross language he reproaches them for not being partridges. With every minute his pace becomes more aggressive, more angry. He grunts and growls in his throat. He scatters the stones, the manure heaps, the rotting stubble, and the pimpernels turning green between the sods. From time to time, at a distance, bevies of partridges start up, but so far away that they can scarcely be distinguished. Then the hunter's wrath redoubles. He showers invective upon the partridges, defies them, covers them with outrages, not being able to cover them with lead, and says to me:

"They are too cowardly to come within reach of my gun!"

And he begins to philosophise:

"For that matter, it is the same throughout France. Everything is bolting, everything is disappearing,—principles, virtues, glory, game. We are a rotten people, a finished people. There is no longer any authority; there is no longer anything. Do you suppose that universal suffrage will repopulate the hunting-grounds? In former times did the partridges start up at such distances? In former times they started up at one's very feet, the partridges. But you see, then there was an authority, principles, laws! What do you expect? So it is! As long as there shall be no authority, no iron hand, no sword, . . . yes, a sword, . . . well, so it will be!"

At this point a hare starts up and scampers off. The hunter aims, fires, and misses.

"Oh! the beast!" he cries, "the dirty beast!"

Then, recovering from his moment of stupefaction, he begins to run after the hare, barking like a dog. . . .

It has not been a good day. Only three partridges have been killed. The hunters, gathered in a circle around the three birds, lift their voices in lamentation. And as the wing of one of the birds still quivers and a slight spasm of agony runs beneath its feathers, one of the hunters grasps it, crushes its head under his boot heel, and throws it back beside the others, shouting:

"Filthy carrion!"

At night, in the railway carriage that takes us home, the tired hunters sleep in their hides and furs and hair. And I see their lips move, in the pale light that falls upon them, and their hairy mouths open, as if to bark.

They are doubtless dreaming that they are dogs, pursuing, in the virgin plains, hares as big as elephants and partridges with eagles' wings.

Plum Pudding on the Free List.

[New York World.]

One of the most interesting and estimable products of the British Isles is the English plum pudding. It always conforms to the demands of the highest art in shape and color. It has a specific gravity only exceeded by that of a few of the rarest and heaviest metals. It is absolutely indestructible, and one pudding will satisfy the appetite of any but an English family for an entire lifetime. Naturally, when an Englishman sends an American an English plum pudding, the American takes it as a solemn and sacred act of international friendship. As a gift of tobacco is among Indians, as nose rubbing is among Hottentots, so is a gift of plum pudding among Englishmen.

To show his high regard for America and Americans, an Englishman sent R. J. Godwin, of R. J. Godwin & Son, custom brokers at No. 60 Wall street, a splendid English plum pudding, weighing full ten pounds as it lay and guaranteed to weigh a ton when eaten. It arrived on December 22, and was received with due pump and ceremony. Mr. Godwin was there, and Deputy Collector Corey told him no duty would be charged. Thanks to section 1,036, a deputy collector has power to pass free things that are worth less than $1. He decided to consider this plum pudding as a thing of no monetary value, because it had such priceless worth as an art treasure. Mr. Godwin thanked him profusely, and laid hold of the pudding to take it away.

"Not so fast," said Mr. Corey. "We must make haste slowly and with dignity. I must send it over to the stores to be weighed and appraised. A mere matter of form. You can have your pudding in a day or two."

So he sent the pudding away to the stores, and gave Mr. Godwin an order on Deputy Collector Williams to deliver it without duty charge. Mr. Godwin went away. The day before Christmas he, being unable to go himself, sent his most trusted employee to the stores for the pudding. "We will have it at the Christmas dinner to-morrow," he said.

The trusted employee presented Corey's order, and asked for the pudding. "Not so fast," said Deputy Williams. "This pudding is an article of great value. It competes with the great American plum pudding. Twenty per cent. duty, please."

The trusted employee fled to Mr. Godwin. "Pay the duty," said Mr. Godwin. "Here's the money. Pay him his twenty per cent., and bring away my pudding."

So back the trusted employee went, laid down the money, and stretched out his hand for the international treasure.

"No, no, my good man," said Williams. "The great United States government does not transact its business in that indecent, unsystematic way. Is the pudding dutiable or non dutiable? I am right, or Corey is right. I hold the pudding until the matter is decided."

The trusted employee hurried away. Mr. Godwin came and pleaded and stormed. But he got no pudding for his Christmas dinner. Neither did he get it for his New Year's dinner. The pudding lay sadly in a dark corner of the customs stores. And telegrams and letters passed to and fro between the stores and the custom house, between deputies and the collector, between the collector and Washington. Thousands of words were written upon scores of sheets of paper, with the plum pudding as the text.

Last Monday (January 13) was the deciding day. All phases of the subject had been exhausted, all precedents had been examined, all the testimony was in. Collector Kilbreth read, pondered, and gave his decision. The pudding was to come in free. Mr. Godwin bore his treasure away. It was eaten the next Sunday.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

A member writes: "I have been unable to write to any of our targets for nearly three months, owing to having too much work in other ways. I will try one of these days to make up for my delinquency, and write a short letter to all of those I have missed." I am glad to have him keep up his work, even in this shape, rather than drop it altogether. But members should remember that, when one feels bound to do work which has accumulated in considerable arrears, it has the same sort of crushing effect as a pecuniary debt; and that the impression on many targets will be greater if letters are prompt and simultaneous than if they are delayed and scattered. Write promptly, if you can; let me know, if you get noticeably in arrears; and, if accumulations of back work interfere with your

doing the work of to-day, let the back work go as a complete default rather than let the evil propagate itself.

Target, section A.—The "Evening Press," 212 Griswold street, Detroit, Mich., on December 23, published an editorial on Comrade Labadie's lecture in that city that night, containing these words:

Mr. Labadie is not a bomb-throwing Anarchist. He is an impractical dreamer, and lives in a little, visionary world in which the men and women are too constitutionally tired to do wrong. . . . Neither philosophical Anarchy, nor any other sort of Anarchy, will ever be permitted to make much progress in America. It is essentially foreign and essentially vicious. Our people are too patriotic and too practical to take much stock in it. . . . We believe in the largest personal liberty consistent with our form of government; but the line must be drawn somewhere. The public propagation of Anarchistic ideas, whether by Joseph Labadie or John Most, should not be tolerated.

(The entire editorial was reprinted in the last number of Liberty.) Give the editor some of the information he needs about Anarchism.

Section B.—Rev. R. Heber Newton, Barnardsville, N. J., answers as follows the "Voice's" question what he thinks of Mr. Crosby's non-resistance arguments:

In response to your inquiry, I would say that I do not doubt, myself, that Christ "condemned the use of force in defence of life, liberty, and property." He teaches the doctrine of non resistance of evil. And that doctrine seems a prime article of his ethical teaching. As to your question, "If it were attempted to be carried out by Christ's followers, what would be the practical results?" the answer depends upon our belief as to Christ. If he were an enthusiast, ethically, an idealist, impracticable and up-in-the air as to his theories, the "practical results" of following his teachings will be dangerous. If his authority be what the Christian church believes, it may be safe to trust the "practical results" and be content to be his "followers." The world, having never taken him seriously in his ethical teachings, may well be puzzled over the "results" of such an imitation of Christ.

Ask him what he proposes to do toward having these ideas practically carried out by the American people. Show what service he might do the poor (whose party he has espoused in some discussions of the labor problem) by agitating against the governmental use of violence to control business. Show that his words logically require him to acknowledge himself an Anarchist. STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it assails the morality superstition as the foundation of the various schemes for the exploitation of mankind. Max Stirner himself does not expound the doctrine of Egoism in bolder fashion. 30 pages.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petty *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher.
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER Box 1312, New York City.

RIPANS TABULES

RIPANS TABULES regulate the stomach, liver and bowels, purify the blood, are safe and effectual. The best general family medicine known for Biliousness, Constipation, Dyspepsia, Foul Breath, Headache, Heartburn, Loss of Appetite, Mental Depression, Painful Digestion, Pimples, Sallow Complexion, Tired Feeling, and every symptom or disease resulting from impure blood, or a failure by the stomach, liver or intestines to perform their proper functions. Persons given to over eating are benefited by taking a TABULE after each meal. Price, of druggists or by mail, Box (5 vials) 75c., Package (4 boxes) $2.00. Address THE RIPANS CHEMICAL CO., New York. Samples free.

Wind-Harp Songs.

Poems of life, love, nature, liberty, and death. An appropriate gift-book. Nicely bound.

Price, $1.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the author,
J. WM. LLOYD, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem."

This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

PRICE IN CLOTH, $1.00; IN PAPER, 50 CENTS.

PREMIUM OFFER.

Any person purchasing of the undersigned a cloth-bound copy of "The Science of Society" will also receive, free of charge, one copy of "The Review of the Anarchist Case," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull, and of "The Reasons for Pardoning Schwab, *et al.*," by Gov. John P. Altgeld.

Any person purchasing a paper-bound copy will also receive, free of charge, one copy of Tolstoi's "Church and State."

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of
BENJ. R. TUCKER,
EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 394 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMPIRE, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH. Tune: Björneborgarnes Marsch (Finnish War Song). Words by J. Wm. Lloyd. Price, 10 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingalls. 31 pages. Price, 10 cents.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 128 pages. Price, 35 cents.

MY UNCLE BENJAMIN. A humorous, satirical, and philosophical novel. By Claude Tillier. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. With a sketch of the author's life and works by Ludwig Pfau. This work, though it has enjoyed the honor of three translations into German, has never before been translated into English. It is one of the most delightfully witty works ever written. Almost every sentence excites a laugh. It is thoroughly realistic, but not at all repulsive. Its satirical treatment of humanity's foibles and its jovial but profound philosophy have won its author the title of "the modern Rabelais." My Uncle Benjamin riddles with the shafts of his good-natured ridicule the shams of theology, law, medicine, commerce, war, marriage, and society generally. 312 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF IBSENISM. By G. Bernard Shaw. Pronounced by the London *Saturday Review* a "most diverting book," and by the author "the most complete assertion of the validity of the human will as against all laws, institutions, *isms*, and the like, now procurable for a quarter." Ibsen's works have been read very widely in America, and there have been almost as many interpretations as readers. This conflict of opinion will cause the liveliest curiosity to know what view is taken by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not only one of the keenest students of Ibsen, but one of the wittiest writers in England. He takes up the plays *seriatim*, subjects each to searching analysis, and extracts the quintessence of the whole. Nearly 200 pages. Price, paper, 25 cents.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. A serious denunciation of States and Governments, under whatever name or form they may exist. By the famous statesman, Edmund Burke. 36 pages. Price, 10 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $3.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS; Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 50 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBSTER. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1880. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW; Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 21 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.